	biodiversity gain? That is built on the false assumption that the site is currently biodiversity neutral and contains no biodiversity. This is evidently and absolutely not the case.
	Construction
	The talk of a Route Map for Avoidable Waste in Construction would be far better delivered by not constructing. Instead, OUFC and its new owner should be coming to a sustainable business arrangement with Mr Kassam to build a fourth stand at the Kassam and upgrade facilities there.
	This will avoid the need to demolish a perfectly good and adaptable stadium and avoid all of the embodied carbon being lost from this 23 year old site. An approach similar to share ownership of the Kassam site may be an option. Where is the evidence that such discussions been conducted 'to exhaustion' between the old and new owner and OUFC themselves?
	Carbon Reduction Pledges
	and pipe dreams.
	What if the stadium were to be built to Olympic standards or to BREEAM Outstanding and confirmed as this? Instead, we see vaguely aspirational goal to be diluted if they use too much capital funding and start to look like they might not be 'economically viable'.
	A voluntary BREEAM 'Very Good' equates to 55% of what an outstanding build would look like. This application demonstrates absolutely no will to build a sustainable or world class stadium. Simply a cheap and quick build to satisfy the financial benefits of an overseas palm oil investor.
	By simply asking the question 'what if?" OUFC are failing to make any pledges or demonstrate any evidence of agreed and firm CO2e reduction actions or means thereof. they have provided no evidence that any f these 'aspirations will be delivered.
	Given that buildings account for 37% of total GHG emissions; How can Oxfordshire County Council who have supported this project from the start "Do their part to achieve a net zero carbon district by 2030 and to lead through example" whilst acting in this way? Yours faithfully
	C H Asbury
	Resident
Received Date	29/03/2024 17:54:05

Attachments